UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,210	10/17/2001	Sridatta Viswanath	SUN-P6535NP US/NC	7389

35690 7590 04/04/2006		EXAMINER
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.		ALLEN, WILLIAM J
700 LAVACA, SUITE 800		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3625	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
700 LAVACA, SUITE 800
AUSTIN, TX 78701

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/982,210	VISWANATH ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	William J. Allen	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12/19/05</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 17-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 17-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>17 January 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/25/05 & 2/21/06</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Prosecution History

Claim 8 has been amended per applicants response filed on 12/28/2005

Claims 1-15 and 17-25 are pending.

Claim 16 has been previously canceled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-10, filed 12/28/2005, with respect to the provisional double patenting rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 23 under double patenting has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see page 10, filed 12/28/2005, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claim 5 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 5 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-13, filed 12/28/2005, with respect to *mapping the tags of a first data format to tags of a second data format* have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/28/2005 regarding *storing data descriptors describing the contents of the electronic purchase requisition applications, the database further storing data objects and attributes pertinent to the electronic purchase requisition applications content* have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The following is a quotation from paragraphs 8 and 9 of Rivera:

"Upon receiving the purchase order from the buyer, the data manager can

extract relevant data such as document type, buyer identity, supplier identity,

purchase order number, order information, security information, etc. The data

manager can then retrieve a translation map and workflow instruction based

upon the extracted data. Using this translation map and workflow instruction, the

data manager can process the received purchase order and translate it into a

neutral format, e.g., a format not necessarily native either to the supplier or

to the buyer. The neutral format of the purchase order is then stored in a

central database that associates the order information with the appropriate

trading partner and/or document type.

Before the purchase order data is provided to the supplier, the data

manager retrieves a workflow and/or a translation map associated with the

supplier and converts the purchase order from the neutral format to the

supplier-native format according to that translation map. This translated

purchase order is then provided to the supplier's backend system, where it can

be directly incorporated without the need for manual reentry of the data. The

data manager can also perform independent processing and tasks responsive to

the workflow."

The Examiner notes that the relevant data fully constitutes data descriptors and

attributes and describes the contents of the electronic purchase applications.

Furthermore, a translation map is retrieved by the system **based on** the extracted

relevant data. The extracted relevant data is then translated into a neutral format and

stored in a **database**. To reiterate, the extracted relevant data fully constitutes data

descriptors and attributes, which are in turn stored in a database in a neutral format;

thereby, Rivera teaches *a database for storing data descriptors describing the contents*

of said electronic purchase requisition application, said database further storing data

objects and attributes pertinent to said electronic purchase requisition applications

content. Additionally, as noted above, Rivera does not disclose *wherein said tags of*

said first data format correspond to data objects and attributes in said database. The

Examiner notes that Rivera makes use of a translation map that is based on the

extracted data, with the data subsequently translated into a neutral format. The data

objects and attributes, associated translation map, and the resulting stored neutral

format thereby correspond to one another.

Furthermore, as noted in paragraph 2, page 15 of applicant's remarks, Rivera

does not teach *the tags of the first data format correspond to data objects and attributes*

in the database. As noted above by the examiner, the extracted data (i.e. *data objects*

and attributes) has a corresponding translation map, which translates the extracted data

to a neutral format that is stored in a database. The stored neutral format thereby

corresponds to data objects and attributes. The only thing lacking in Rivera is the

utilization of *tags.*

Regarding paragraph 3 on page 15 of Applicant's remarks, Applicant contests

that Rivera fails to disclose "selectively retrieving" one or more of the corresponding

data objects "data objects and attributes". As noted above, Rivera clearly shows the

storage of "data objects and attributes" in a neutral format. Additionally, the format map

can retrieve and filter certain data to be displayed to a user. For example: As noted in

Rivera, a shipping employee could be prevented from viewing pricing data on a shipping

receipt. This filtering thereby provides "selectively retrieving" specific data to be

displayed to a user. Also, Applicant contests in paragraphs 3-4 on page 16 that Rivera

does not provide the aforementioned filtering through use of flags. According to the

Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, third edition, flags are simply "markers of some

type used by a computer in processing or interpreting information". The Examiner

asserts that filtering (and thereby selectively retrieving) data to be displayed to a user,

the system must make use of some type of data marker or identification means in order

to provide for filtering/selectively retrieving. Without a means of marking/identifying the

data being retrieved, the system would not be able to facilitate filtering due to data being

unidentifiable. Therefore, the system and method of Rivera must contain "flags" to

identify data being filtered.

Regarding claims 11, 17, and 23, the remarks set forth for claims 11, 17, and 23

parallel the remarks set forth for claim1. The remarks for claims 11, 17, and 23 are

thereby responded to using the same rationale.

Regarding claim 3, Rivera clearly shows the storage of "data objects and

attributes" in a neutral format as noted above. Once stored in the neutral format, the

system and method of Rivera can translate the neutral format (which includes the

relevant data and thereby the descriptors, attributes, etc.) to the supplier format to allow

access by the supplier (see at least: abstract, [0031]). The data descriptors are therefor

pre-defined for a supplier, with the supplier accessing the order data defined by the buyer.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Applicant's arguments see pages18-20, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 5, 6, 13, and 19 has been withdrawn.

Regarding claims 13 and 19, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contests that Rivera fails to show tag information associated with the XML data of the first type into corresponding tag data of XML data of a second type. Applicant further notes the pre and post-translation format of the data be in XML. Rivera shows the intermediary format of data to be XML (see at least: paragraph 0053). In doing so, the pre and post-translation formats can then be considered XML data of a *first* and *third type*. By being translatable to XML, the pre and post-translation formats must contain data to be compatible with XML, thereby, these formats contain XML data of a first, second, and third type. Additionally, as noted above, Rivera clearly shows data descriptors, attributes, etc. (see at least: paragraphs 0008 and 0009).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11-5, 17-21, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being unpatentable over Rivera et al. (US 2002/0107699, hereinafter referred to as

Rivera) in view of Iwamoto et al. (us 6,658,483, herein referred to as Iwamoto).

Referring to claim 1, Rivera teaches an electronic purchasing and procurement

system comprising:

•   *An applications content mapping module for automatically mapping electronic*

purchase requisition application content of a first data format processed internally to a

second data format to determine corresponding data objects (see at least: module 195,

format maps 200, Paragraph 0053).

•   *A database for storing data descriptors describing the contents of said electronic*

purchase requisition applications, said database further storing data object and

attributes pertinent to said electronic purchase requisition applications content wherein

said tags of said first data format correspond to data objects and attributes in said

database (see at least: Claim 33, Paragraphs 0008 and 0009). The Examiner notes that

the databases of Rivera's system are capable of storing data descriptors or format maps

and data objects and attributes. These databases are located in the Data Manager and

can be used combined or separately.

•   *Wherein said applications content mapping module is configured to map said first*

data format to said second data format to determine data objects and attributes in said

database corresponding to content in said second format (see at least: module 195,

format maps 200, Paragraph 0053).

• *Applications content translation logic in response to receiving a particular*

purchase request associated with a particular purchasing requisitioner, for dynamically

presenting translated applications content in a third format, suitable for delivery to said

purchasing requisitioner and also for translating content to said particular purchasing

requisitioner for presentation thereto by selectively retrieving one or more of said

corresponding data objects and attributes according to a flap wherein said flag indicates

whether or not a corresponding data object or attribute is to be presented in said third

format (see at least: document viewer 147, document viewing module 210, Paragraph

0057, 0058).

Rivera teaches all of the above as noted but does not expressly teach the applications

content mapping module utilizing tags and being configured to map the tags of said first

data format to tags of said second data format. Iwamoto teaches a content mapping

module utilizing tags and being configured to map the tags of said first data format to

tags of said second data format (see at least: col. 14, line 40 to col. 15, line 23). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have

modified the invention of Rivera to have included content mapping module *utilizing tags*

and being *configured to map the tags of said first data format to tags of said second*

data format taught by Iwamoto in order to provide an electronic transaction system, a

set-up processing module, and a set-up supporting apparatus which make a set-up

work of a translator to be used at a customer efficient (see at least: Iwamoto, col. 2,

lines 25-31).

Referring to claim 2, Rivera further teaches:

•   *An applications content configuration module coupled to said applications*

content mapping module for providing specific mark up language templates which, in

combination with said electronic purchase requisition applications

content, are translated into content suitable for presentation to a particular purchasing

requisitioner (see at least: translation module 195, format maps 200, Paragraph 0053

0058). The Examiner notes that the translation module translates the document and the

data is formatted in combination with the document-viewing module and displayed in a

suitable manner for a particular trading partner, buyer, or seller, etc.

Referring to claim 3, Rivera further teaches:

•   *The applications content configuration module is extensible to include predefined*

data descriptors for the contents of said electronic purchasing requisition applications

content (see at least: abstract, paragraphs 0031 and 0036).

Referring to claim 4, Rivera further teaches:

•   *The applications content mapping module comprises data formatting logic for*

formatting the contents of said electronic purchase requisition applications content from

said first format into said second format (see at least: translation module 195,

Paragraph 0053).

Referring to claim 5, Rivera teaches all of the above as noted but does not expressly

teach *pre-defined tag information responsive to said second data format for enabling*

said applications content translation logic to retrieve associating data information

describing the contents of said electronic purchase requisition applications content.

Iwamoto teaches *pre-defined tag information responsive to said second data format for*

enabling said applications content translation logic to retrieve associating data

information describing the contents of said electronic purchase requisition applications

content (see at least: col. 14, line 32 to col. 15, line 23). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of

Rivera to have included content mapping module *utilizing tags* and being *configured to*

map the tags of said first data format to tags of said second data format taught by

Iwamoto in order to provide an electronic transaction system, a set-up processing

module, and a set-up supporting apparatus which make a set-up work of a translator to

be used at a customer efficient (see at least: Iwamoto, col. 2, lines 25-31). The

Examiner notes that the standard message table contains *pre-defined tag information*

such as display portion, data portion, etc.

Referring to claim 7, Rivera further teaches:

• *The applications content mapping module further comprises a two step mapping logic for automatically mapping index information of said first data format into said tag information of said second data format* (see at least: paragraph 0052, 0058). The Examiner interprets the index information to be listed or cataloged information of the database, the product identifiers of the suppliers catalogs, the suppliers listed with a buyer, etc.

Referring to claim 8, Rivera further teaches:

• *The applications content configuration module is an executable text file:* The components of the present invention can be implemented in most any programming language and on most any hardware system (Rivera: paragraph 0064). The Examiner notes that the modules are capable of being executable text files.

Referring to claim 11, Rivera teaches:

• *A server coupled to the XML content mapper* (see at least: Buyers 105, suppliers 110, Internet 130, data manager 135, paragraph 0030). The Examiner notes that the data manager is a server.

• *A plurality of good and services catalogs residing in a database in said server, each of said catalogs comprising unique goods and services identification parameters* (see at least: paragraph 0052, claim 35). The Examiner notes that Rivera teaches multiple buyers and suppliers using the system.

- *A procurement and purchasing Extensible Markup Language (XML) content translator for retrieving in-bound XML data of a first type from a source external to said server in response to purchase requisition request from a particular order and generating an intermediary XML data of a second type and presenting outbound XML data of a third type suitable for delivery in response to said purchasing requisition request:* The data manager 135 acts to process and translate data transmitted between the trading partners so that data can be received in a format native to the particular trading partner regardless of the format used by any other trading partner (Rivera: paragraph 0030). The translation module 195 can translate the purchase order from its native format to a neutral format, such as XML or CBL, and then store the translated document in a document database 215 (see at least: paragraph 0053, 0054). The Examiner notes that the data from a requisition is translated from an initial format to a neutral or intermediary format (XML) to a third supplier format, each constituting *inbound, intermediary,* and *out-bound* XML data of a first, second, and third type respectively.

- *XML data traversing logic for traversing said database to extract data objects and attributes corresponding to said particular purchase order according to a mapping of information of said in-bound XML data to said intermediary XML data* (see at least: paragraph 0053).

- *A document exchange framework module coupled to said content mapper for providing data execution code for processing said purchase requisition request in said electronic purchasing and procurement system according to a flag for the out-bound*

XML data, wherein said flag indicates whether or not a corresponding data object or attribute is to be presented in said out- bound XML data (see at least: paragraph 0057, 0058, steps 325 and 330). The Examiner notes that the data manager allows for filtering the format, through flags, to show or hide specific information.

Rivera teaches all of the above as noted but does not expressly teach extracting data objects and attributes corresponding to said particular purchase order *according to a mapping of information.* Iwamoto teaches a content mapping module utilizing tags and being configured to map the tags of said first data format to tags of said second data format. Iwamoto also teaches retrieving information *according to a mapping of information* (see at least: col. 14, line 40 to col. 15, line 23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Rivera to have included extract data objects and attributes corresponding to said particular purchase order *according to a mapping of information* taught by Iwamoto in order to provide an electronic transaction system, a set-up processing module, and a set-up supporting apparatus which make a set-up work of a translator to be used at a customer efficient (see at least: Iwamoto, col. 2, lines 25-31).

Referring to claim 12, Rivera further teaches:

•   *XML content formatting templates specific to purchase order line item data object and attribute information defining said goods and services in said purchase order* (see at least: paragraph 0008). The Examiner notes that order information is line item data object and attribute information.

Referring to claim 13, River further teaches:

• *XML translation logic for translating tag information associated with said XML data said first type into corresponding tag information of XML data of said second type for processing by said electronic purchasing and procurement system:* (see at least: Paragraphs 0008, 0009, and 0053).

Referring to claim 14, Rivera further teaches:

• *A data configuration file for providing configuration information corresponding to the content of said XML data of said first type to said XML translation logic:* The document-viewing module 210 then retrieves a format map, also called a "style sheets" from the template database 211 and the data for that document is formatted accordingly (steps 325 and 330) (Rivera: paragraph 0058). The Examiner notes that style sheets provide configuration information, such as margins, etc.

Referring to claim 15, Rivera further teaches

• *The data configuration file is extensible to dynamically alter translation data provided to the XML translation logic.* The internal adapter 142 also can accept new "plug-in" edge interfaces 143 as new document-exchange and e-business protocol standards are published. For example, new edge adapters 143 can be developed to support Universal Description Discovery and Integration (UDDI) and Open Buying on the Internet (see at least: paragraphs 0036, 0049).

Referring to claims 17-21 and 23-25, the limitations set forth in claims 17-21 and

23-25 closely parallel the limitations set forth in claims 1-15. Claims 17-21 and 23-25

are thereby rejected under the same rationale.

2.   Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Rivera in view of Iwamoto, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of

Meltzer et al. (US 6,125,391, herein referred to as Meltzer).

Referring to claim 6, Rivera in view of Iwamoto teaches *the first data format of said*

electronic purchase requisition applications content is substantially compliant with a

neutral format, which is then translatable to XML (see at least: Rivera, paragraph 0053).

Rivera in view of Iwamoto, however, does not expressly teach the first data format to be

compliant with Extensible Markup Language (XML) content. Meltzer teaches the first

data format to be *compliant with Extensible Markup Language (XML) content* (see at

least: abstract, col. 3, lines 25-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Rivera in view of

Iwamoto to have included the first data format to be *compliant with Extensible Markup*

Language (XML) content as taught by Meltzer in order to provide protocols supporting

transactions among diverse clients coupled to a network and commercial transactions

among platforms having variant architectures (see at least: Meltzer, col. 1, lines 31-35).

Referring to claim 9, Rivera further teaches:

•   *The XML content is substantially compliant with the Open Buying on the Internet*

Standard: New edge adapters 143 can be developed to support Universal Description

Discovery and Integration (UDDI) and Open Buying on the Internet (OBI) (Rivera:

paragraph 0036). The Examiner notes that the XML content would be compliant with

OBI standards with the supporting edge adapters.

3.   **Claims 10 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Rivera in view of Iwamoto, as applied to claims 17 and 20, and further in view

of Katz et al. (US 2002/0174000, herein referred to as Katz).

Referring to claim 10, Rivera in view of Iwamoto teaches all of the above as noted;

however, Rivera does not expressly disclose the particular client being a wireless

personal computer system and the XML data being compliant with Wireless Markup

Language content. Katz teaches a system and method of integrating and analyzing data

through a plurality of software modules to assist in procurement, sourcing, and decision-

support. Katz further teaches wherein *the particular purchasing requisitioner is a*

wireless personal computer system (see at least: paragraph 0226). The Examiner notes

that the system allows for the use of wireless protocols through the "handheld WAP

device" and thus a wireless personal computer system. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rivera in view of

Iwamoto to include the particular client as a wireless personal computer system as

taught by Katz in order to service changing and established protocols (Rivera:

paragraph 0036) and be usable with any signals that may be transmitted to, from, or

within the system (Rivera: paragraph 0065).

Referring to claim 22, Rivera in view of Iwamoto teaches all of the above; however,

Rivera does not expressly teach *the XML data is substantially compliant with Wireless*

Markup Language content. Katz teaches *the XML data is substantially compliant with*

Wireless Markup Language content (see at least: paragraph 0226). The Examiner

notes because the client is using a "handheld WAP device" wireless personal computer

system, the system is compliant with Wireless Markup Language content. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Rivera in view of Iwamoto to include the XML data that is compliant with Wireless

Markup Language content as taught by Katz in order to be usable with any signals that

may be transmitted to, from, or within the system (Rivera: paragraph 0065).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to William J. Allen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1443. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wynn W. Coggins can be reached on (571) 272-7159. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William J. Allen
Patent Examiner
March 5, 2006